

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 15, 2001 LB 574

Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Brashear. Senator Bromm, on AM0522.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank...thank you, Mr. President. And, Senator Brashear, if I thought...I...I want you to know if I thought you were providing more security and a framework or guidelines that would narrow the release of biometric identifiers I would...I would support the amendment, but I...I just see it...I see it quite clearly, to me, that it is opening up the release of biometric identifiers for many more purposes than...than I think we would want them to be released for. And...and what are we talking about when we're talking about biometric identifiers? The department tells me the most...the most likely identifier will be facial features; that in many other places where they have used a digital image and a digital license they have used facial features where, when someone comes in and wants to get a replacement digital license and they indicate they are Jim Jones, they will be able to, with...with computer technology, attempt to determine whether the facial features of this person who presents himself is the same person as who obtained the original driver's license. And so that is one of the reasons why it would be helpful in...I think in some...preventing some fraud and so forth. Now, I want to, for the record, make it clear that subparagraph (3) of Section 4 on page 3 of the bill, where it says: The department shall have use of the biometric identifiers, shall not release them except to a law enforcement agency for law enforcement purposes, the intent of that is, is to be absolutely no broader, as far as law enforcement is concerned, than the standards contained in 2909.01, and if we need to do an amendment to maybe mirror a little language from 2909.01 that might...that might make you more comfortable. I'm not sure. But that language in...in 2909.01 says, for use by, and I'll leave out some words, for use by a law enforcement agency in carrying out the agency's functions. Now, I don't know if that's more restrictive or not than the language we have in the bill, which says "for law enforcement purposes", but if we would say for...except to a law enforcement agency in carrying out the agency's functions, I would be very receptive to that, if we'd plug that into page 3. But if we...if we make